



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/924,299	08/08/2001	Kenneth Joseph Schulz	10015893-1	3067

7590 01/13/2005
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

MARTIN, NICHOLAS A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/924,299

Applicant(s)

SCHULZ ET AL.

Examiner

Nicholas A. Martin

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2154

1. Claims 1-22 are presented for examination.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because on page 9, line 23, there is a typographical error referencing the “embodiment 392a”. This is seen as reference character 302a because there is no aforementioned reference character 392a in any of the figures.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1 and 12 are objected to because it lists the parts 1(a, b, e, f, g) where it is assumed to read parts 1(a, b, c, d, e).
4. Claims 13-20 are objected to because when claiming dependency to a previous claim, each claim references “the method of claim 11”. Claim 11 is not a method, it is a program and therefore for the remainder of the examination, claims 13-20 are seen as claiming dependency to claim 12.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. The following term lacks antecedent basis:

- i. the dirty buffer – Claim 1(e), line 9

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Jackson, Jared Joseph (hereinafter Jackson), US 2002/0169769, in view of Ito et al. (hereinafter Ito), US 2002/0016792).

7. As per claim 1, Jackson teaches a program for caching an entitlement set, the program being stored as a computer readable medium, the entitlement set designating services and products a user is entitled to access in a network, the program comprising:
logic for:

(a) logic configured to receive a login request from the user (Paragraph [0053]);

(b) logic configured to determine whether a memory element indicating a triggering event related to user exists, the memory element having been created after a triggering event (Paragraph [0043]);

8. Jackson does not teach a program for caching an entitlement set comprising:
logic for:

(e) logic configured to read a preexisting entitlement set from a memory element if the dirty buffer does not exist, the preexisting entitlement set indicating a first scope of

Art Unit: 2154

access to the network; and

(f) logic configured to calculate a new entitlement set if the dirty buffer does exist, the new entitlement set indicating a second scope of access to the network; and

(g) logic configured to allow the user a third scope of access to the network, the third scope of access being the first scope of access or the second scope of access.

9. Ito teaches a file system comprising logic for:

(e) logic configured to read a preexisting entitlement set from a memory element if the dirty buffer does not exist, the preexisting entitlement set indicating a first scope of access to the network (Paragraphs [0092], [0122] and [0126]); and

(f) logic configured to calculate a new entitlement set if the dirty buffer does exist, the new entitlement set indicating a second scope of access to the network (Page 14, claim 5); and

(g) logic configured to allow the user a third scope of access to the network, the third scope of access being the first scope of access or the second scope of access (Paragraphs [0092], [0122] and [0126] and Page 14, claim 5).

10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Ito and Jackson because they both deal with file systems allocating access to resources. Furthermore, the teaching of Ito to allow logic configured to read a preexisting entitlement set from a memory element if the dirty buffer does not exist, the preexisting entitlement set indicating a first scope of access to the network; and logic configured to calculate a new entitlement set if the dirty buffer does exist, the new entitlement set indicating a second scope of access to the network; and logic configured to allow the user a third scope of access to the network, the third scope

Art Unit: 2154

of access being the first scope of access or the second scope of access would improve functionality of Jackson's system by reducing the time taken to access memory cues and access data more readily.

11. As per claim 2, Jackson teaches the program of claim 1, wherein the login request includes user identification information (Paragraph [0054]).

12. As per claim 3, Jackson does not explicitly teach the program of claim 1, wherein the memory element is a dirty buffer.

13. Ito teaches an element where memory is a dirty buffer (Paragraph [0091]).

14. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Ito and Jackson because they both deal with file systems allocating access to resources. Furthermore, the teaching of Ito to allow wherein the memory element is a dirty buffer would improve functionality of Jackson's system by allowing the memory to be changed before it is written to disk to secure lack of loss of information.

15. As per claim 4, Jackson does not explicitly teach the program of claim 3, wherein the dirty buffer identifies the triggering event.

16. Ito teaches a process wherein a dirty buffer identifies a triggering event (Paragraphs [0089-0091] and [0109]).

17. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Ito and Jackson because they both deal with file systems allocating access to resources. Furthermore, the teaching of Ito to allow wherein a dirty buffer identifies a triggering event would improve the functionality of

Art Unit: 2154

Jackson's system by allowing the memory to identify triggers/interrupts in order to recognize the cues to ensure the security of information in the file systems.

18. As per 5, Jackson does not explicitly teach the program of claim 1, wherein the triggering event is the creation of a new linking agreement.

19. Ito teaches a process wherein the triggering event is the creation of a new linking agreement (Page 14, claim 1; Page 15, claim 14).

20. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Ito and Jackson because they both deal with file systems allocating access to resources. Furthermore, the teaching of Ito to allow wherein the triggering event is the creation of a new linking agreement would improve the functionality of Jackson's system by allowing for alternate routes to be established when loading resources cued from memory.

21. As per claim 6, Jackson does not explicitly teach the program of claim 1, wherein the triggering event is the creation of a contract with a customer.

22. Ito teaches a process wherein the triggering event is the creation of a contract with a customer (Page 14, claim 1; Page 15, claims 14 and 15).

23. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Ito and Jackson because they both deal with file systems allocating access to resources. Furthermore, the teaching of Ito to allow wherein the triggering event is the creation of a contract with a customer would improve the functionality of Jackson's system by allowing for alternate routes to be established when loading resources cued from memory.

Art Unit: 2154

24. As per claim 7, Jackson teaches the program of claim 1, wherein the preexisting entitlement set is read from a persistent memory element (Paragraphs [0006] and [0008]; Page 4, claim 14).

25. As per claim 8, Jackson teaches the program of claim 1, further comprising logic for:

allowing the user access to an information technology resource center, the scope of the access based on the entitlement set (Paragraphs [0048-0049]).

26. As per claim 9, Jackson teaches the program of claim 1, further comprising logic for:

reading a linked agreement associated with the user (Paragraphs [0006] and [0008]; Page 4, claim 14).

27. Jackson does not teach the program of claim 1, further comprising logic for:

wherein information read from the linked agreement is used to create the new entitlement set.

28. Ito teaches a process further comprising:

wherein information read from the linked agreement is used to calculate the new entitlement set (Page 14, claim 1; Page 15, claim 14).

29. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Ito and Jackson because they both deal with file systems allocating access to resources. Furthermore, the teaching of Ito to allow wherein information read from the linked agreement is used to calculate the new entitlement set would improve the functionality of Jackson's system by allowing for alternate routes to be established when loading resources cued from memory.

Art Unit: 2154

30. As per claim 10, Jackson teaches the program of claim 9, further comprising logic for an entitlement based on the linked agreement (Paragraphs [0006] and [0008]; Page 4, claim 14).

31. Jackson does not teach the program of claim 9, further comprising logic for wherein the entitlement used to calculate the new entitlement set.

32. Ito teaches a process of claim 9, further comprising logic for wherein the entitlement used to calculate the new entitlement set (Page 14, claim 1; Page 15, claim 14).

33. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Ito and Jackson because they both deal with file systems allocating access to resources. Furthermore, the teaching of Ito to allow wherein information read from the linked agreement is used to calculate the new entitlement set would improve the functionality of Jackson's system by allowing for alternate routes to be established when loading resources cued from memory.

34. As per claim 11, Jackson does not explicitly teach the program of claim 10, further comprising logic for:

calculating a user level entitlement, wherein the user level entitlement is used to calculate the new entitlement set.

35. Ito teaches a process comprising logic for:

calculating a user level entitlement, wherein the user level entitlement is used to calculate the new entitlement set (Paragraph [0005]; Page 14, claim 1; Page 15, claim 14).

36. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Ito and Jackson because they both deal with file systems allocating access to resources. Furthermore, the teaching of Ito to allow

Art Unit: 2154

calculating a user level entitlement, wherein the user level entitlement is used to calculate the new entitlement set would improve the functionality of Jackson's system by allowing for particular paths/routes to be established when loading resources cued from memory, specific to each ID.

37. Claims 12-22 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 1-11 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to "System And Method For Caching Entitlement Sets".

- | | | |
|------|-----------------|----------------|
| i. | US 5892900 | Ginter et al. |
| ii. | US 2002/0069243 | Raverdy et al. |
| iii. | US 6427230 | Goiffon et al. |
| iv. | US 2002/0095399 | Devine et al. |
| v. | US 2002/0065924 | Barrall et al. |

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Martin whose telephone number is (571) 272-3970. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30 a.m. - 5:30 p.m.


Art Unit: 2154

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3970.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

nam

January 6, 2005


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100